

standing up elections, running elections, and certifying their own elections. It is of the people, by the people, for the people that this process is carried out in each and every one of our counties. And you know what, that is how it is supposed to be.

Article I, section 4 of our Constitution clearly states—here it is:

Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof.

Well, how about that? The Constitution delegates that authority to the State legislatures, and that is why our States' secretaries of state work with our counties to make certain the process is put in place.

You know, I had the opportunity to serve on my county's local election commission prior to my being in elective office. One person, one vote—that is the No. 1 rule that guided the decisions they made. When we recruit poll workers, it is the No. 1 concern that drives people to go sign up. When we train the volunteers who are staffing polling places, it is the No. 1 rule to teach. Every person gets one vote. All legally cast votes are counted. That is the way it is supposed to work—one person, one vote.

Here in the Senate, I am concerned that my Democratic colleagues have forgotten about this rule. Why else would they once again pledge to move a piece of legislation that would throw "one person, one vote" out the window? Many of my Republican colleagues have taken to calling H.R. 1 or S. 1 the Politician Protection Act or the For the Politician Act, and I will have to agree that is a fairly apt description.

There are a lot of problems with this bill, but I want to focus on a few key provisions that will gut "one person, one vote" and destroy confidence in our elections.

If this bill passes, say goodbye to meaningful voter ID laws. My Democratic colleagues kept the idea of these requirements intact, but to please their radical base, they added a loophole that would force every single jurisdiction to accept affidavits in lieu of identification—that is right, an affidavit. They may as well have banned voter IDs because that loophole makes requirements that voters prove they are who they say they are absolutely meaningless. They can just sign a statement saying "I am who I say I am" without having to show proof.

The bill also requires States to allow paid campaign operatives to engage in ballot harvesting schemes. That is right. This allows your paid campaign operatives to engage in ballot harvesting schemes. Now, these ballot harvesting schemes have been proven time and again to increase the risk of fraud, so much so that many States on their own moved forward and banned ballot harvesting schemes. Why did they ban this? Because it leads to fraud in elections.

Inexplicably, my colleagues also want to throw ballot drop boxes into the mix. They pitched them as a convenience, but that convenience will be nearly impossible to monitor and to protect 24 hours a day, which means that it will be nearly impossible to monitor and protect the ballots that are inside those boxes, and these boxes then become a fairly convenient way to stuff the ballot box.

But perhaps the most dangerous, counterproductive, and outright infuriating provision my Democratic colleagues have included in this mess of a bill is a restriction against voter roll maintenance. Anyone with a bit of common sense knows how inaccurate or duplicate entries in a dataset can add up. That leaves these datasets in a state of disrepair, and that is how fraud and mistakes occur.

It is just one more provision in a bill raising red flags for local officials in every single State in this country. And this red flag, in particular, is prompting people to ask me if my Democratic colleagues involved in drafting this bill have ever actually volunteered at a local polling place, which really tells you a lot about how shortsighted this legislation is.

This bill really doesn't have anything to do with voting rights. This is a politically motivated Federal takeover of elections that would give us the exact opposite of what is laid out in the Constitution.

The Founders—the Founders—granted the States power over their own elections for a reason. The Federal Government is beyond incompetent to get this job done. If you like the service you get from the IRS or the EPA or OSHA, that is what you could expect the next time your community has an election.

If we allow this bill to pass, the promise of one person, one vote will crumble. The promise of counting eligible ballots and not counting ineligible ballots would go by the wayside. And what do you get in exchange? The promise of chaos, confusion, and a lack of confidence in the integrity of the vote.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK FLINT

Madam President, the time has come for Team Blackburn to say goodbye to our fearless leader and current chief of staff, Chuck Flint.

Chuck first joined my team in the House as a member of our legislative staff. He was eager to prove himself capable and well versed on our legislative issues, and I will tell you, he succeeded. In the 7 years since he first walked through my office door, he has grown into one of the finest office chiefs of staff I have seen on the Hill and one of the finest political strategists here on Capitol Hill, one of my most trusted advisers, and, I will add, the most enthusiastic softball player on Team Whiskey Business—the most enthusiastic I think we have ever fielded.

I wish Chuck, Jessica, and little Everett all the hope and happiness in

the world as they embark on their next beautiful adventure together.

We will miss him tremendously, but no matter how far they travel, they will always have a home with Team Blackburn and in service to the Volunteer State.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 149, Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Jacky Rosen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Sherrod Brown, Edward J. Markey, Brian Schatz, Ron Wyden, Elizabeth Warren, Mark R. Warner, Raphael Warnock, Benjamin L. Cardin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "nay", and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cornyn
Bennet	Cardin	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Carper	Duckworth
Blunt	Collins	Durbin
Burr	Coons	Feinstein